The Power of Possession, revisited

Benjamin James

April 3, 2026

To discuss possession is to risk immediate misunderstanding. The term arrives burdened with ideas modern thought has already filed away, filled with images of demons, exorcisms, superstition, pre-scientific fear, and theatrical displays of irrationality. It appears to belong to a world that no longer commands intellectual seriousness. The modern mind, trained to distinguish external causation from internal states and to prefer measurable mechanism over symbolic description, assumes the matter settled. Possession names a mistake. At best it survives as a metaphor; at worst it lingers as a relic of coercive religious imagination. However, concepts do not endure across civilizations merely because they are false in interesting ways. They persist because they compress a recurrent feature of human experience that later vocabularies only partially replace. The question is not whether possession is literally real in any supernatural sense. The more difficult question is what reality the concept once made available to thought, and whether that reality has disappeared or simply lost its name.

The purpose of revisiting possession is therefore neither theological nor antiquarian. It is not to defend demonology, validate spiritual authority, or retreat from secular explanation into mysticism. Nor is it to abolish responsibility by turning all human failure into an invasion from elsewhere. The task is narrower and more precise. Possession can be understood as a symbolic model for a familiar but difficult fact; human beings are often moved by forces that are not wholly reducible to conscious intention, yet are not wholly external to them either. People do things before they know why they are doing them. They speak sharply before deciding to be cruel. They retreat, escalate, panic, submit, imitate, or harden without ever passing cleanly through the sequence our modern self-understanding prefers to imagine. Something in the person is active, but not yet integrated. Something is happening through them before it becomes something they can claim as theirs.

This difficulty is often obscured by our moral architecture of modernity, which treats the individual as the basic unit of explanation. A person is assumed to perceive, interpret, deliberate, and then act. Agency is pictured as temporally centered and inwardly transparent. If action occurs, it is because a self chose it, and if a choice occurred, responsibility follows accordingly. This model has practical advantages. Law, medicine, and politics all rely upon some version of it, but as a phenomenological account of lived behavior it is often inaccurate. It describes the idealized subject of modern institutions more faithfully than the lived subject who must navigate ambiguity, latency, habituation, stress, and social pressure. Possession matters because it belonged to an older vocabulary that did not take self-possession for granted. It named a condition in which agency was distributed, unstable, and partially captured without ceasing to be agency altogether.

Ordinary experience offers abundant evidence for this instability. Much of what people do does not feel, in the moment of enactment, like the conclusion of a reflective process. Sarcasm appears before intent is fully formed. Irritation erupts with a force disproportionate to the immediate exchange. Anxiety saturates a day in which no clear danger presents itself. Social defensiveness emerges in a conversation that, on inspection, contained no explicit threat. These responses are then narrated as if they had been chosen in a straightforward sense. One says, after the fact, that one was impatient, rude, insecure, or simply tired. Such interpretations can be correct, but they tend to arrive after the behavior has already occurred. They function less as direct descriptions of what governed the moment than as one's retrospective efforts to restore continuity between the enacted self and the narrated self.

The prevailing model of action imagines a sequence of perception, interpretation, decision, and action. It is not wholly wrong, but it is too orderly. Ordinary conduct follows a different temporal structure. Perception triggers activation of a patterned response; behavior emerges; interpretation follows later as a form of reconstruction. The conscious self, in these cases, does not stand prior to action as its full author. It enters belatedly as its interpreter, custodian, or justifier. The gap matters. What looks like irrationality may in fact be rapid patterned response outrunning reflective awareness. The person is not absent, but

neither are they fully sovereign at the relevant moment. They are inhabited by dispositions that operate more quickly than conscious explanation can manage.

This temporal asymmetry helps explain why behavior so often feels both intimate and alien. A person recognizes the action as theirs yet also experiences a degree of estrangement from it. They are not surprised that they did it, exactly, but they are unsettled by how little mediation preceded it. This is one reason modern discourse oscillates uncomfortably between moralization and psychologization. If a person is rude "for no reason," either their character is suspect or some pathology must be at work. If they are anxious without immediate cause, either they are undisciplined or chemically disordered. These explanations can sometimes be useful, but they often conceal the more basic fact that much human conduct is patterned before it is chosen. The reason the act feels unreasonable is not necessarily that it lacks a cause. It may be that the cause is not available to the conscious model the person uses to understand themselves.

What is activated in such moments is not a mysterious essence but a layered complex of learned and ambient patterns. Social life installs fast responses long before explicit thought can arbitrate them. Status-defense heuristics train the body and voice to preempt vulnerability. Emotional conditioning prepares irritation or withdrawal at cues too subtle to register as conscious threat. Cultural scripts distribute expectations about confidence, deference, aggression, shame, and belonging. Repeated exposure to insecurity lowers the threshold at which a background threat model begins to run. Institutions, markets, family structures, and media ecologies saturate our environment with incentives that are lived not as abstractions but as bodily urgency, anticipatory tension, or defensive posture. In such conditions, the person becomes the site at which broader patterns are enacted, often without being their origin in any simple sense.

This point is easy to state and difficult to hold in focus, because modern individualism has trained thought to locate cause where responsibility can most easily be assigned. If behavior occurs in a body, it is presumed to originate there, but many behaviors are better understood as locally enacted and supra-individually structured. A person carries them, performs them, and may be accountable for them, yet the pattern itself is distributed across histories of

training, ambient pressures, institutional arrangements, and collective moods. Social patterning becomes embodied. Structural insecurity becomes temper. Competitive environments become sarcasm. Chronic precarity becomes vigilance. No single factor "causes" the act in isolation, but the act nevertheless arises from a field larger than the self that performs it.

This is not determinism. It does not mean the person is a puppet, nor that reflection is powerless. It means only that causality is layered. The human subject is not a sealed origin-point but a porous locus where multiple timescales meet. Some patterns are slow, sedimented over years. Others are rapid, circulating through a crowd, a platform, an institution, or a family system with contagious force. The important correction is not that agency disappears, but that it is less immediate, less transparent, and less solitary than modern moral language assumes. Once this is admitted, the old concept of possession becomes newly legible. It offered a way of naming those moments when behavior was experienced as one's own and yet not simply reducible to autonomous will.

Possession understood distributed agency across scales in non-literal terms. It allowed a person to say this is happening through me, but not wholly from me; I am implicated, but not fully in command; something exceeds my local control. Whatever its theological trappings, the concept performed a significant philosophical and psychological function. It preserved the reality of capture without requiring the person to identify entirely with what had captured them. This matters because total self-identification with overpowering conduct can produce either despair or denial. If what overtakes me is simply my deepest self, then there is no standpoint from which I can resist it. If, on the other hand, it is wholly alien, then responsibility evaporates. Possession avoided both conclusions imperfectly but often effectively. It named the force as real, the person as involved, and the situation as one requiring response beyond mere condemnation.

In this sense, possession was not primarily an explanation of mechanism. It did not tell anyone how, in analytic detail, the takeover occurred. It functioned instead as an interface for modeling capture. The personification of a force into spirit, demon, or invading presence did not merely mystify conduct. It rendered distributed causality cognitively actionable. The

afflicted individual could be seen as constrained rather than simply corrupt. The community could intervene without pretending that the behavior was either fully chosen or wholly innocent. Ritual, witness, discipline, and care could be mobilized because the situation was understood as both moral and structural. The possessed person had not ceased to be a person, but neither were they expected to resolve the condition by self-command alone.

The power of the concept lays in its phenomenological fidelity. People often feel moved by more than their reflective will. Addiction, panic, ideological capture, compulsive cruelty, escalating anxiety, contagious rage, these states are experienced as having momentum beyond local intention. Our old vocabulary of possession preserved that asymmetry. It allowed conduct to be experienced as non-sovereign without becoming unintelligible. This should not be confused with romanticization. Possession was frightening because it named a genuine vulnerability; the self could be entered, tilted, amplified, narrowed, or driven by forces that were not fully of its choosing. To say that the concept was powerful is not to say that all its applications were wise. It is to say that it tracked something modern language struggles to describe.

Once possession is seen as a model of distributed agency, responsibility must be rethought. Modern moral frameworks tend toward a binary. Either a person chose an action, in which case responsibility is direct and blame follows accordingly, or they did not choose it, in which case responsibility is suspended or removed. This binary is convenient for institutional reasoning but crude as an account of human behavior. Many states of capture occupy a middle terrain. The person acts, yet under constraint. They are not innocent in the sense of being passive matter, but neither are they fully self-determining. A possession framework, at its best, preserved this middle terrain. It allowed one to say, you acted, and the act matters; but you acted while partially governed by a force you did not create, could not wholly perceive, and may not have been able to interrupt alone.

This middle terrain is ethically important. Consider behaviors that modern society repeatedly misdescribes. Addiction is treated as weakness, panic behavior as irrationality, ideological capture as proof of bad character, chronic anxiety as a personal defect, ambient cruelty as simple vice. In each case, individuals are held to a standard of sovereignty that

their situation does not support. They are assumed to have full information, full temporal control, and full capacity to exit the loop in which they are operating, but this is frequently false. People do not always know the sources of their activation. They are not always acting on a timescale that permits calm reflection. They are not always positioned materially or socially to step away from the pressures shaping them. To insist upon total agency under such conditions is to misdescribe the action before judging it.

At the same time, the correction cannot simply be absolution. To dissolve all responsibility into structure is to render conduct untouchable precisely where response is needed. The challenge is to hold agency as partial, delayed, recoverable, and socially scaffolded. A person may be responsible not because they authored each impulse transparently, but because they participate in the conditions under which integration, interruption, and repair become possible. Responsibility then includes not only what one did in a moment of capture, but what supports or weakens one's ability to recognize patterns, build resistance, accept intervention, and re-enter social life after disruption. This is a thicker and more realistic account than our assumption of total self-possession. It also aligns more closely with how communities have often managed difficult conduct in practice, whatever their official theories say.

Possession thus avoids the false binary between "fully chosen" and "not responsible at all." It neither erases the self nor deifies it. Instead, it places the self within a field of forces and asks what kinds of response are appropriate to a being that is neither sovereign in the modern sense nor wholly determined by external causes. This framing has consequences for punishment, blame, treatment, and reintegration. An individual captured by a destructive pattern may need constraint, but also interruption, translation, ritual, therapy, medication, communal support, or environmental change. None of these measures makes sense if conduct is reduced solely to inner vice. All of them become more intelligible once conduct is understood as arising within layered conditions.

Why, then, did modernity reject possession so decisively? The answer is not simple hostility to religion. Possession threatened several of the philosophical commitments around which modern institutions were built. Modernity requires individuated agency, legal clarity,

psychological interiority, rational self-possession, and secular causal explanation. The figure of the autonomous person is not merely a moral preference; it is a functional requirement for modern law, contract, medicine, and governance. To admit that subjects are porous to distributed forces in ways that exceed reflection is to complicate responsibility at every level. Possession implied partial non-sovereignty, socially embedded behavior, and causality that crossed boundaries between self and world too fluidly for our modern categories to tolerate comfortably.

There were good reasons for the rejection. Possession language was often abused. It justified arbitrary spiritual authority, disguised mental abuse, licensed coercive ritual, and exposed vulnerable people to misrecognition or violence. Our modern translation of possession into pathology, superstition, manipulation, or lack of discipline did not occur without gains. Skepticism protected against fraud. Scientific inquiry clarified mechanism. Legal frameworks restrained some forms of arbitrary accusation. The modern subject, whatever its limits, emerged in part as a defense against the dangers of spiritualized social control. Any attempt to recover possession conceptually must preserve those gains. The issue is not whether modernity should have retained literal demonology. It should not have.

Total rejection, however, carries losses of its own. In casting possession entirely into the realm of error, modernity discarded a vocabulary for patterned capture. It retained words for disorder, compulsion, trauma, stimulus, and pathology, but lost a broader symbolic language for the experience of non-sovereign conduct under distributed constraint. What disappeared was not only superstition but a way of understanding how a person could be overtaken without being reduced to malfunction. Modern thought became better at precision and worse at phenomenological scale. It could explain more mechanisms while often failing to provide a humanly intelligible picture of how conduct is shaped by loops, contagions, pressures, and inheritances that no isolated will can master in real time.

This loss becomes especially visible in contemporary everyday life, where possession no longer appears dramatic enough to deserve the name, yet low-grade forms of capture are everywhere. One might call them micro-possession, or transient capture of behavior by fast-cycle patterns before reflective integration. The examples are ordinary. Sarcasm functions

as preemptive status defense, appearing before vulnerability can register consciously. Rudeness can operate as anticipatory aggression, a quick strike against a threat the person cannot yet articulate. Anxiety becomes a persistent background activation of a threat model untethered from any immediate material danger. Doomscrolling works as attentional capture, recruiting the nervous system into loops of vigilance and intermittent reward. Social defensiveness emerges where ambient competition has become so normalized that neutrality itself feels suspicious. These phenomena are not identical, but they share a structural feature. Action or affect is mobilized by a pattern before the person can fully interpret the pattern's source.

Their causelessness is largely apparent. People often say they were anxious for no reason, rude without meaning to be, or consumed by a mood that made no sense in context. What this usually means is not that the state lacked a cause, but that the cause was temporally delayed, structurally distributed, and inaccessible to the conscious model available in that moment. The immediate situation does not contain enough information to explain the response because the response was primed by prior conditioning, ambient signals, cumulative stress, low-level competition, bodily memory, platform design, or unresolved social threat. When no symbolic framework exists for such distributed causality, the person is left with either self-reproach or confusion. They search the present moment for a cause that belongs to a larger field.

This is why everyday possession is easy to misdiagnose. Without a language of patterned capture, micro-escalations are interpreted as one's character. A sarcastic person becomes simply cruel. An anxious person becomes simply disordered. A defensive person becomes simply difficult. Sometimes these judgments are not baseless, but they often truncate the causal field too quickly, locating what is enacted in the person while ignoring what is moving through them. The person becomes the site of blame rather than the point at which a distributed pattern becomes visible. This is not only unjust; it is analytically weak. It makes intervention harder by misidentifying the scale at which the problem lives.

To say this is not to retreat into therapeutic indulgence. The point is not that every irritation hides a structural drama, nor that all harmful behavior should be diffused into context until

no moral friction remains. The point is that conduct can be immediate without being self-originating in the modern sense. Some of the most common forms of suffering and cruelty are sustained precisely by our refusal to recognize this. A society that interprets all activation as choice alone will moralize capture, privatize suffering, and shame people for being unable to single-handedly exit loops that were never theirs to begin with. It will then wonder why advice, punishment, and self-management techniques fail to produce lasting change.

What remains worth preserving from possession, then, is not its cosmology but its structure. Possession should be retained as a phenomenological and social concept for those moments when a person is governed by a dynamic that exceeds reflective agency without extinguishing it. It offers a language of patterned capture, a model of distributed agency, and a recognition of non-sovereign subjectivity. It allows one to distinguish between the person and the loop without separating them absolutely. It makes room for intervention without pretending that intervention occurs on a blank slate of pure will. Most importantly, it preserves an insight that our modern choice-language obscures; not all enacted behavior is fully self-authored at the moment of enactment.

To reframe possession without demons is therefore neither to revive spiritual authority nor to dissolve moral judgment. It is to say that the self is more porous than modernity admits, and that our concepts should reflect this. Literal demonology can be rejected. Manipulative appeals to invisible entities can be refused. Total absolution can be resisted. The underlying insight should remain. People are sometimes governed by forces they did not consciously author, that they cannot immediately interpret, and that become visible only in their effects. A concept like possession helps preserve this reality as something neither mystical nor merely pathological, but structurally human.

What such a concept offers is not a solution but a better distribution of explanatory weight. It reminds us that agency does not always begin where consciousness thinks it does. It reminds us that behavior can be morally serious without being fully sovereign. It reminds us that intervention may need to occur at the level of environments, rhythms, communities, technologies, and collective norms, not only at the level of individual exhortation. It reminds us, too, that persons are not identical to every pattern that passes through them. The refusal

to collapse personhood into capture is one of the deepest ethical achievements of our older language, even where its metaphysics cannot be sustained.

The modern individual is not as sealed, self-transparent, or temporally sovereign as our dominant models assume. People are often moved before they understand. Interpretation often follows activation rather than preceding it. Patterns larger than any individual can inhabit conduct without abolishing personhood. Refusing to name this does not eliminate it. It simply renders the experience harder to think and easier to moralize. Where possession once named a condition of being overtaken, modernity often offers only the language of choice, disorder, or defect. None of these is always wrong. All are often insufficient.

What is needed is not a return to old beliefs but a willingness to recover the scale of the reality those beliefs once compressed. A concept like possession can be philosophically rehabilitated if treated not as a claim about spirits but as a description of how agency is sometimes distributed, narrowed, and captured within complex systems. This does not solve the tension between freedom and constraint. It situates that tension more honestly. It makes visible the difference between a person and the pattern currently moving through them, without pretending that the two are unrelated. It gives back a language for conditions under which blame alone is too shallow and innocence too simple.

We do not need to believe in demons to see that people are sometimes governed by forces they did not consciously choose. We do not need to revive exorcism as metaphysics to recognize that many loops require interruption, witness, and collective response rather than isolated self-command. We may, however, need something better than the language of choice alone if we are to think clearly about conduct that is neither fully authored nor wholly alien. Our old word for that condition was possession. It was dismissed because its cosmology became untenable, but what it named has remained.

References

James, B. (2026). Gods and Demons; a structural ecology of supra-individual forces. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMGAD-2

James, B. (2026). In defense of religion. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMIDO-2

James, B. (2026). Inverting the soul. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMITS-3